

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 80-159 are pending in this case. Claims 92-110 and 132-150 are withdrawn. Claims 80, 86, 120, 124, 126, 142, 149, and 150 are amended. Amended Claims 80, 86, 120, 124, 126, 142, 149, and 150 are supported by the original claims and specification,¹ and therefore add no new matter.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 80-83, 87-91, 120-123, and 127-131 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Ludwig et al. (U.S. Patent 5,978,835, hereinafter “Ludwig”). Claims 84-86 and 124-126 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ludwig. Claims 111-119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Ramasubramanian et al. (U.S. Patent 6,172,672, hereinafter “Ramasubramanian”).

An interview was held on March 10, 2005 to discuss the present case, attended by Examiner Dinh and Ed Tracy. The applicants would like to thank the examiner for his time in conducting the interview. The differences between the pending claims and the cited references were discussed in detail. Applicants’ representatives proposed amendments based on these differences. The examiner agreed that the present amendment, presented herewith, overcomes Ludwig.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 80 as anticipated by Ludwig, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claim 80 recites in part, “determining a start position for frame data representing at least two of the plurality of frames, wherein said start position of a frame is a location of a first byte of the frame.”

¹See e.g. Specification at page 20, Table 1.

In contrast, Ludwig describes a system for synchronizing audio and video sequences. Each recorded video sequence is tagged with time codes or frame numbers. Each recorded audio sequence is tagged with time codes or, if co-recorded with video data, video frame numbers.² However, it is respectfully submitted that Ludwig does not teach or suggest “determining a start position for frame data representing at least two of the plurality of frames, wherein said start position of a frame is a location of a first byte of the frame,” as recited in Claim 80. Consequently, Claim 80 (and Claims 81-91 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Ludwig, as Ludwig does not teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 80.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 111-119 as unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Ramasubramanian, it is noted that Claims 111-119 are dependent from Claim 80, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Ramasubramanian does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Ludwig. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 111-119 are patentable over Ludwig in view of Ramasubramanian.

Claim 120 recites similar elements to Claim 80. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 120 (and Claims 121-131 and 151-159 dependent therefrom) is patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 80.

As withdrawn Claims 92-110 and 132-150 depend from Claims 80 and 120, which are believed to be patentable, it is respectfully requested that withdrawn Claims 92-110 and 132-150 be rejoined and allowed.

²See Ludwig, column 29, lines 49-60.

Application No. 09/128,244
Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2004

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Michael E. Monaco
Registration No. 52,041

I:\ATTY\ET\265170US\265170US-AMD1.DOC